

NMR spectroscopy and computing beyond myth and fiction

Sergio De Filippo*

Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche, Università di Salerno

Via Allende I-84081 Baronissi (SA) ITALY

and

Unità INFN Salerno

(February 1, 2008)

Starting from the physical algebra, namely the algebra of operators corresponding to macroscopic measurements, a thorough classical theory of NMR spectroscopy is constructed. Its effectiveness in emulating quantum computing stems from the exponential growth of the classical phase space dimension with the number of magnetic nuclei per molecule, this solving a standing scientific dispute. As a by-product, the differential equations for the evolution of macroscopic variables give an exact setting for simulation of NMR spectroscopy both in general and for quantum computing emulation.

03.67.Lx, 03.65.Bz, 05.30-d, 76.70.Fz

At room temperature relaxation and decoherence times for the spin degrees of freedom of magnetic nuclei of suitable molecules in liquid solutions put in strong magnetic fields of some Tesla are exceedingly long, even several seconds [1]. In concert with the presence of chemical shifts, giving rise to small differences in Larmor frequencies for nuclei of the same kind, and of the weak J-coupling between them, this would make such systems ideal candidates for quantum computing [2] if only one could control these degrees of freedom. Even though this is not realistic for a single molecule (s.m.), it is achieved by NMR spectroscopy in a statistical sense for macroscopic samples. NMR experiments are traditionally analyzed in terms of statistical ensembles of s.m.'s and, if the J-coupling is ignored, each molecule is equivalently described either classically or quantum mechanically, due to the linearity of the equations of motion [1]. This same linearity makes the difference between the ensemble

viewpoint and the real physical situation, where measurements are done on the whole sample, partially irrelevant. On the other hand the introduction of the J-coupling in order to describe the so called multiple resonances, within the ensemble approach seemingly forces to use the quantum description [1,3,4].

This description in terms of an ensemble of quantum systems is taken as the starting point of the nice idea of emulating quantum computing by NMR spectroscopy [5,6]. In particular this is done using the fact that the traceless part of a single particle thermal state can be identified with the traceless part of a pure state, which gives rise to the notion of a pseudo-pure state.

The above setting is physically unsatisfactory since the macroscopic high temperature character of the states involved and the classical nature of the measurements performed, namely the absence of wave function collapse, are an unambiguous indication that the soundest description is classical. On the other hand the quantum ensemble description, in addition to its lack of physical cogency in treating the coherent electromagnetic field produced in modern pulse NMR interferometry, is a source of considerable confusion. In fact, as reported in a recent paper [4], the quantum-mechanical nature of processes involving such macroscopic pseudo-pure states is a matter of debate. In paper [7], for instance, it is argued that, *although since the first proposals to use NMR for quantum computation, there has been surprise about the apparent ability to perform quantum computations in room-temperature thermal ensembles, entanglement analysis suggests that current NMR experiments should be considered as simulations of quantum computations, rather than true quantum computation.* In other papers on the contrary one can find explicit references to the quantumness of NMR (*Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this experiment is that the experimental results cannot be explained by a classical model of two interacting spins* [8]) and to the presence of entangled states (*Because the N spins in each molecule may be in entangled quantum superposition states, our computer is a quantum one* [6]). Then, while the single particle quantum ensemble paradigm turns out to be a fruitful viewpoint in analyzing NMR spectra for structure analysis in chemistry, a more transparent physical setting is needed if one wants to

address more fundamental questions. This is witnessed by recent attempts to analyze the structure of the space of density matrices corresponding to the aforementioned pseudo-pure states [7,13,14], to construct classical probabilistic models to mimic NMR experiments [9] and to analyze models for ensemble computation in general [10].

The aim of this paper is to show that, by sticking to the physical algebra [11], namely the operator algebra physically relevant to the system in consideration, a somehow definitive answer to the fundamental questions raised by the NMR realization of quantum algorithms can be given. In fact it turns out that the correct collective quantum description, like in the case without J-coupling, is equivalent to the corresponding classical one, where expectation values replace operators. The physical description of the whole sample can be recast in such a way to be formally equivalent to the one previously used for a s.m. and allowing quantum computing emulation. In particular the thermal state of the physical algebra, which is a convex combination of states belonging to inequivalent irreducible representations [15], plays the role of a pseudo-pure state. As a relevant by-product, the present approach leads, without any approximation, to a system of linear differential equations for classical observables and classical inner variables, which may be of use in the analysis and in numerical and/or analytical simulations both of NMR spectra in general and of the NMR emulation of quantum computing [15].

Once proven that the kinematics and the dynamics of the physical systems used in NMR spectroscopy are ordinary classical ones, the issue of if and how these systems attain quantum computation capabilities is solved. Even though they turn out to behave as classical analogue computers, they share with quantum computers, as shown in the following, what up to now was considered their unique feature of the exponential growth of state space dimensions with the physical dimensions [16]. This answers the question [17] about what makes NMR more powerful than conventional classical computing [10] if it does not involve entanglement.

To be specific the Hamiltonian operator of N identical molecules, each of them containing just 2 magnetic nuclei (to keep algebra to the minimum), for times shorter than decoherence times, is given by the sum of the Zeeman and the J-coupling terms:

$$H \equiv \sum_{\alpha=1}^N H^{\alpha} = - \sum_{p=1}^2 \gamma_p \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \vec{B} \cdot \vec{S}^{\alpha p} - J \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \vec{S}^{\alpha 1} \cdot \vec{S}^{\alpha 2}, \quad (1)$$

where $\vec{S}^{\alpha p}$ denotes the spin relating to the p th nucleus in the α th molecule and $\vec{B}$ is a uniform external generally time dependent magnetic field, by which the Hamiltonian is invariant under molecule permutations. Since no external action on the system is going to act on different molecules in different ways, one can naturally consider as physical algebra the algebra of permutation invariant operators. While the Zeeman term can be written in terms of the macroscopic spin vectors $\vec{S}^p \equiv \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \vec{S}^{\alpha p}$, this is not so for the J-coupling term, by which the tensor operators

$$C_{jk} \equiv \sum_{\alpha=1}^N S_j^{\alpha 1} \cdot S_k^{\alpha 2} \quad (2)$$

are to be treated as independent ones, while their commutation relations both between themselves and with the macroscopic spin vectors may be computed in terms of their explicit expression (2). To avoid unnecessary complications in illustrating the main ideas, it is appropriate to limit consideration to spin 1/2 nuclei, in which case the commutators, after some algebra, for $\hbar = 1$ are given by

$$[C_{ij}, C_{kl}]_- = \frac{i}{4} (\varepsilon_{jlm} \delta_{ik} S_m^2 + \varepsilon_{ikm} \delta_{lj} S_m^1), \quad [C_{ij}, S_k^1]_- = i \varepsilon_{ikl} C_{lj}, \quad [C_{ij}, S_k^2]_- = i \varepsilon_{jkl} C_{il}, \quad (3)$$

where both commutation relations for spin in general and anticommutation relations for the spin 1/2 Clifford algebra

$$[S_i^{\alpha p}, S_k^{\beta q}]_- = i \delta_{\alpha\beta} \delta_{pq} \varepsilon_{ikl} S_l^p, \quad [S_i^{\alpha p}, S_k^{\alpha p}]_+ = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ik} \quad (4)$$

have been used, while of course the macroscopic spin vectors fulfill the same commutation relations as the microscopic ones. Here and henceforth summation is implied on repeated tensor indices.

By using these equations and the expression for the Hamiltonian operator as an element of the permutation invariant algebra

$$H = - \sum_{p=1}^2 \gamma_p \vec{B} \cdot \vec{S}^p - JC_{ii}, \quad (5)$$

one obtains the evolution equations in the physical algebra:

$$\begin{cases} dC_{ji}/dt = i [H, C_{ji}] = -\gamma_2 \varepsilon_{ikl} B_k C_{jl} - \gamma_1 \varepsilon_{jkl} B_k C_{li} - J \varepsilon_{ijl} (S_l^2 - S_l^1) \\ dS_i^p/dt = i [H, S_i^p] = -\gamma_p \varepsilon_{ijk} B_j S_k^p + (-1)^p J \varepsilon_{ijk} C_{kj}, \quad p = 1, 2. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

These equations, as announced, are linear, by which they hold for expectation values too. To be specific they correspond to Hamiltonian classical equations with a classical Hamiltonian having the same expression as the quantum one in eq. (5) and fundamental Poisson brackets obtained by the fundamental commutators in eq. (3) according to the reverse Dirac prescription $[\hat{A}, \hat{B}] \rightarrow i\hbar \{A, B\}$. Of course the same equations hold for the vector and the tensor operators of a s.m., which in turn are algebraically equivalent to the Heisenberg equations for a s.m., this showing why the bulk in consideration can emulate a s.m. dynamics, and vice versa why the s.m. model works in NMR spectroscopy.

It should be stressed that this result is independent from the simplifying assumptions concerning the single spin value and the number of magnetic nuclei per molecule, even though the corresponding equations are in general more complex. Consider for simplicity the generalization relevant to most NMR computing experiments, removing only the restriction on the number of magnetic nuclei. In such a case the commutators between the tensor operators $C_{jk}^{pq} \equiv \sum_{\alpha=1}^N S_j^{\alpha p} S_k^{\alpha q}$ give rise to terms linear in third rank tensor operators $C_{jkl}^{pqr} \equiv \sum_{\alpha=1}^N S_j^{\alpha p} S_k^{\alpha q} S_l^{\alpha r}$, whose evolution equations have to be added to eq.s (6). In order to do that commutators between third and second rank tensor operators have to be evaluated and so on. The end result amounts to consider all tensor operators

$$C_i^p \equiv S_i^p, \quad C_{jk}^{pq}, \quad C_{jkl}^{pqr}, \quad C_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_n}^{12 \dots n} \equiv \sum_{\alpha=1}^N S_{i_1}^{\alpha 1} S_{i_2}^{\alpha 2} \dots S_{i_n}^{\alpha n}; \quad i, j, k = 1, 2, 3; \quad p, q, r = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad (7)$$

which generate a $(4^n - 1)$ -dimensional Lie algebra, since they are linearly independent and all their mutual commutators turn out to be linear in terms of them. While the Hamiltonian operator retains its structure

$$H = - \sum_{p=1}^n \gamma_p \vec{B} \cdot \vec{S}^p - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p \neq q} J_{pq} C_{ii}^{pq}, \quad (8)$$

the generalizations of eq.s (6), though staying linear, grow in their number and become more complex, except for those giving the time derivatives of macroscopic spin vectors, which essentially keep their form.

As to the initial conditions for the classical evolution equations with reference to NMR spectroscopy, they correspond to the expectation values in the thermal state, which can be equivalently considered either as a state of the physical algebra [15] or of the total algebra generated by all microscopic spin operators. In the latter case for the generic tensor operator C one gets

$$\langle C \rangle = \frac{Tr \left[\left(\sum_{\alpha=1}^N C^{\alpha} \right) \exp \left(-\beta \sum_{\alpha=1}^N H^{\alpha} \right) \right]}{Tr \exp \left(-\beta \sum_{\alpha=1}^N H^{\alpha} \right)} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \frac{Tr [C^{\alpha} \exp (-\beta H^{\alpha})]}{Tr [\exp (-\beta H^{\alpha})]}, \quad (9)$$

which obviously coincides with N times the expectation value of the corresponding s.m. observable with respect to the s.m. thermal state used in the traditional approach.

In conclusion some remarks are in order.

The plethora of classical variables at first sight may look puzzling, since most of them are not easily accessible. While static measurements only probe, in principle, the three components of magnetization, the very precise dynamic methods of modern NMR spectroscopy [1] can give an indirect access, according to the values of the chemical shifts and the J-couplings, to all or some of them, which then play the role of more or less hidden variables. Parenthetically, every possible symmetry of the s.m. Hamiltonian, due to the specific values of chemical shifts and J-couplings adds together with the permutational symmetry in reducing the physical algebra and then the number of classical variables. On the other hand one can solve the evolution equations for all variables but for macroscopic spin vectors in terms of these ones, whose equations then become nonlocal in time and completely describe the system. Of course the seemingly infinite memory time of these hysteretic equations disappears if one takes account of the dissipative terms to be added to describe the long time behavior [15].

One of the sources of what I call the mythology of NMR spectroscopy is its *explicit demonstration of spinor character for a spin-1/2 nucleus* [12]. While this is considered usually as a proof of some sort of quantumness implied in NMR measurements [1], the present approach shows unambiguously that quantum mechanics is only involved, as for most computations in condensed matter physics, in deriving equations connecting classical observables. If one considers for instance spin-1 magnetic nuclei, then the operator algebra of the single-spin state space is not linearly generated by the spin operators, which leads to the appearance of more general tensors involving eight linearly independent operators generating (with the identity) the single spin associative algebra [15]. Then the value of the spin is explicitly reflected in the number of independent classical variables and in the form of classical equations. On the other hand this has to be so if the equivalence between the differential equation for the s.m. density matrix and the classical bulk evolution equations holds true, by which for instance for spin 1/2 just $4^n - 1$, namely the number of independent real elements in the density matrix, classical equations are needed, while, if for instance only vector nuclei are present, this number becomes $9^n - 1$.

While what has been shown proves the substantial equivalence between quantum computation and classical bulk computation in systems like the NMR ones, which exhibit an exponential growth of the number of classical macroscopic degrees of freedom with the number of quantum microscopic ones, this should not raise unjustified optimism about the perspectives of this kind of classical non conventional computation. The author has the marked feeling that the decrease of the signal-noise ratio as the classical macroscopic degrees of freedom grow in number will prove to be a general obstruction on the way of using it as an alternative to quantum computation. Within the present approach the analysis of this issue, namely of the signal strength, amounts to the evaluation of the aforementioned dissipative terms [15].

Acknowledgments.— Thanks are due to M. Rasetti and M. Salerno, whose encouragement led me to undertake this research.

This paper was supported by M.U.R.S.T., Italy and I.N.F.M., Salerno.

* Phone: +39 89 965229; FAX: +39 89 965275; electronic address: defilippo@sa.infn.it

- [1] C.P. Slitcher, *Principles of Magnetic Resonance (3rd ed.)*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1990).
- [2] A.M. Steane, Rep. Prog. Theor. Phys. **61**, 117 (1998), references therein.
- [3] D.G. Cory, M.D. Price and T.F. Havel, Physica D **120**, 82 (1998).
- [4] T.F. Havel, S.S. Somaroo, C.-H. Tseng and D.G. Cory, LANL quant-ph/9812086 v2 (1999).
- [5] D.G. Cory, A.F. Fahmy, T.F. Havel, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. **94**, 1634 (1997).
- [6] N.A. Gershenfeld, I.L. Chuang, Science **275**, 350 (1997).
- [7] S. L. Braunstein, C. M. Caves, R. Jozsa, N. Linden, S. Popescu and R. Schack, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1054 (1999).
- [8] I.L. Chuang, N. Gershenfeld, M.G. Kubinec and D.W. Leung, Proc. Roy. Soc. London A **454**, 447 (1998).
- [9] R. Schack, C. M. Caves, LANL quant-ph/99030101 v2 (1999).
- [10] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5672 (1998).
- [11] S. De Filippo, LANL quant-ph/9910005 v2 (1999).
- [12] M.E. Stoll, A.J. Vega, and R.W. Vaughan, Phys. Rev. A **16**, 1521(1977).
- [13] K. Zyczkowski, P. Horodecki, A. Sanpera and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 883 (1998).
- [14] G. Vidal and R. Tarrach, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 141 (1998).
- [15] S. De Filippo, forthcoming paper.
- [16] R. Jozsa, Lect. Notes in Comp. Science **1509**, 103 (1999).
- [17] D.P. Di Vincenzo, review of [13], <http://quickreviews.org> (1998).